



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,330	03/28/2001	Akira Matsumoto	939_023	4237

25191 7590 09/06/2002

BURR & BROWN
PO BOX 7068
SYRACUSE, NY 13261-7068

EXAMINER

PATEL, TULSIDAS C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/819,330

Applicant(s)

MATSUMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

T. C. Patel

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

General Status

1. This is a Second Non-Final Action on the Merits. Claims 1-16, are pending in the case.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 98/05989 or Watanabe et al. (US 6,045,269).

WO '989 in figure 4b, discloses fiber optic array comprising a holding member 21 with V-shaped grooves 22, the outermost fiber 4a would be more than 5 times the radius of the fiber, which is of the magnitude 125 microns, and the pitch between the groove is disclosed to be 127 microns (column 16, line 42 of US reference). Grooves are 90 degree grooves (also see sketch-1 attached) and the calculated distance L is $R \cdot \sin 45^\circ + R$ or 106.69 microns and height of adhesive or 'Y' is 87.38 microns and therefore, value of Y satisfies the equation $L/6 \leq Y \leq L$. For claim 2, the amount to which the fiber protrude above the surface is the same as the thickness of the adhesive. For claims 3 and 7, the thickness relationship $L/4 \leq Y = L$ is also satisfied with the dimensions calculated in the sketch-1. For claims 4 8, 9, the adhesive disclosed is thermo-hardening adhesive, the epoxy based adhesives are well in

Art Unit: 2839

the art and it would be obvious to use the epoxy based adhesive. For claims 6 and 13-15, figure 5 discloses a step portion where covered portion of the fibers are positioned.

4. Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ota et al. (US 6,195,495).

Ota et al. in figures 12 and 13, discloses fiber optic array comprising a holding member 128 with V-shaped grooves 127, the outermost fiber 4a would be more than 5 times the radius of the fiber (figure 1c), which is of the magnitude 125 microns. Grooves are 90 degree grooves (see column 6, line 42) and the calculated distance L is $R \cdot \sin 45 + R$ or 106.69 microns and height of adhesive or 'Y' is between 10-90 microns, and therefore, value of Y satisfies the equation $L/6 \leq Y \leq L$ for most of the values of Y . For claim 2, the amount to which the fiber protrude above the surface is the same as the thickness of the adhesive. For claims 3 and 7, the thickness relationship $L/4 \leq Y = L$ is also satisfied with Y dimensions above 27 microns. For claims 6 and 13-15, figure 1a, 2 disclose a step portion where covered portion of the fibers are positioned.

5. Claims 5, 10-12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 98/05989 or Watanabe et al. (US 6,045,269) or Ota et al. (US 6,195,495) in view of EP 943, 942.

As discussed above, WO 98/05989 or Watanabe et al. (US 6,045,269) satisfies the limitations of claims 1-4, 6-9 and 13-15 and Ota et al. satisfies the limitations of claims 1-3, 6-7 and 13-15. However, both do not disclose the width of cover plate being different than the

Art Unit: 2839

holding member. EP 943 942, in figure 5, discloses cover plate being different than the holder and also discloses a step at 58. For claim 4, the selection of adhesive is a matter of design choice.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to width of cover plate different than the base plate as taught by EP '942, so as to provide space for soldering the cover plate with the holder.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Applicant presented arguments in relation to the reference of Fukuyama '945. The Examiner has withdrawn the previous rejection and presented with a new rejection based on WO and Watanabe '269 as well as previously cited reference of Ota et al. The added claims 7-16 are also rejected.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to T. C. Patel whose telephone number is (703) 308-1736. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus can be reached on (703) 308-3119. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/819,330

Page 5

Art Unit: 2839

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1736.

T. C. Patel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2839

tcp
August 30, 2002